arXiv:1110.1172v1 [astro-ph.CO] 6 Oct 2011

Imperial/TP/11/TK/01

# Thermally induced perturbations in inflation

Richard Lieu[1] and T.W.B. Kibble[2]
[1]*Department of Physics, University of Alabama, Huntsville, AL 35899*
[2]*Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ, U.K.*

In some versions of the theory of inflation, it is assumed that before inflation began the universe was in a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) stage, with the energy density dominated by massless particles. The origin of the nearly scale-invariant density perturbations is supposed to be quantum fluctuations in the inflaton field. Here we point out that under those conditions there would necessarily also be large thermally induced density perturbations. It is commonly asserted that inflation would smooth out any pre-existing perturbations. But that argument relies on linear perturbation theory, which would be rendered invalid. Under those circumstances there is no reason to believe that inflation would have the desired smoothing effect. Even without a prior FRW phase, there could be problems because of the Gibbons-Hawking temperature of de Sitter space.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Bp

The theory of inflation [1–3] provides attractive solutions to a number of cosmological problems, including the large-scale homogeneity and flatness of the universe. It has garnered strong support from the `COBE` and `WMAP` observations of the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMBR) [4–8]. Quantum fluctuations in a scalar inflaton field can explain the origin and near scale-invariant spectrum of the primordial density perturbations, although getting the amplitude right requires fine tuning. But establishing the preconditions for inflation has proved problematic.

Early versions of the theory envisaged a pre-inflationary Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) stage. One of the claimed advantages of the theory was that the rapid expansion effectively erased all traces of that earlier phase, although it was realized early [9] that that is not strictly true; what it does is not to eliminate perturbations but to stretch them to unobservable scales. This leaves open the question of whether there could be perturbations on very tiny scales that are stretched to observable size. It has been shown [10] that without drastic modifications such perturbations could not explain the observed power spectrum of density perturbations. Here we wish to argue that under rather general conditions these perturbations would indeed be inevitable and besides having the wrong spectrum would be far too large to be consistent with the use of linear perturbation theory. This is because thermal radiation has large fluctuations on scales comparable with the thermal wavelength, and these scales have been stretched to cosmological size today. Under these circumstances, it is not possible to say what the outcome would be.

It has previously been argued [11] that inflation requires fine-tuned initial conditions in the sense that the relevant part of the universe must already be very smooth. We suggest that it is essentially impossible to satisfy that condition if there is a pre-inflationary FRW stage.

There are obvious ways in which the theory could avoid these problems. Most simply, the universe could be born inflating [12, 13]. Later versions of inflation, such as chaotic inflation [14, 15] do not necessarily begin with a pre-inflationary FRW phase, and might therefore seem to be unaffected. There is, however, a possible complication. Because de Sitter space has a horizon, it is impossible completely to avoid a thermal background, though it is not clear in that case what the effect would be.

Let us assume that in the pre-inflationary phase the segment of the universe from which today's Hubble volume evolved contained a fluid of massless particles, with interactions weak enough to treat them as free, but strong enough to maintain thermal equilibrium. We also assume the existence of an inflaton field providing vacuum energy that will eventually come to dominate and induce a period of inflation.

Now suppose that the vacuum energy starts to dominate at an initial time $t_{\rm i}$, at which $\rho_{\rm r} = \rho_{\rm v}$, where $\rho_{\rm r}$ stands for the energy density of the radiation and $\rho_{\rm v}$ for that of the inflaton field. Inflation ends at a reheating time $t_{\rm rh}$ when the vacuum energy is converted to radiation. Since $\rho_{\rm v}$ is nearly constant during the inflationary era, this means that the physical temperature $T_{\rm phys}$ of the radiation is approximately the same at $t_{\rm i}$ as the reheating temperature just after $t_{\rm rh}$. This is a large temperature, but still some orders of magnitude below the Planck energy. It is convenient to use a 'comoving temperature' $T = aT_{\rm phys}$ which is nearly constant outside the inflationary period. More precisely, $g^{1/3}T$ is constant, where $g$ is the number of helicity states of massless particles (with fermions counted as $\frac{7}{8}$). For the universe since reheating, allowing for the effect of neutrino decoupling and electron-positron annihilation,

$$g^{1/3}T = \left(\frac{43}{11}\right)^{1/3} T_0, \tag{1}$$

where $T_0 = 2.7\text{K}$ is the CMB temperature today. Thus the approximate equality of the physical temperatures before and after inflation means that

$$\frac{T_\mathrm{i}}{T_\mathrm{rh}} = \frac{T(t_\mathrm{i})}{T(t_\mathrm{rh})} \approx \frac{a_\mathrm{i}}{a_\mathrm{rh}} = \frac{a(t_\mathrm{i})}{a(t_\mathrm{rh})} = e^{-N}, \tag{2}$$

where $N$ is the number of $e$-folds of inflation (assuming there is no change in the value of $g$). Equivalently, the comoving temperature in the pre-inflationary phase is

$$T_\mathrm{i} \sim 0.3e^{-N}T_0. \tag{3}$$

In any thermal system there are fluctuations. We are interested in the dimensionless power spectrum $\mathcal{P}(k)$ of the density fluctuations. [$\mathcal{P}(k) = (k^3/2\pi^2)P(k)$, where $P(k)$ is the Fourier transform of the density correlation function.] Here $k$ is also comoving, so $k/T$ is the same as in physical units. Then so long as $k \ll T$, classical thermodynamic arguments [16] tell us that

$$\mathcal{P}(k) \sim \frac{60gk^3}{\pi^2T^3}. \tag{4}$$

The important question is what happens when $k/T$ becomes of order unity, or in other words when the wavelength we are interested in becomes of the same order as the typical wavelength of the radiation. Clearly (4) suggests that in that limit the perturbations become of order unity, and indeed that can be verified by a more detailed calculation.

The problem here is that the relevant scale can easily be one of cosmological significance. According to (3), $k \sim T$ when

$$1/k \sim 3e^N/T_0. \tag{5}$$

Thus for $N = 60$ this scale would be a few Mpc.

It has been argued that any pre-existing perturbations present before the start of inflation will be ironed out by the rapid expansion [17]. However, the argument fails if these perturbations are of order unity, because then linear perturbation theory is invalid. It is not obvious that such perturbations would be effectively smoothed. Only a calculation going beyond perturbation theory could answer the question.

One possible escape might seem to be to assume a substantially larger value of $N$, say $N \gtrsim 70$. In that case the length scale at which $k \sim T$ would be larger than the Hubble radius. There are at least two problems with this solution. Firstly, it cannot be assumed that $\mathcal{P}(k)$ becomes small for $k \gg T$. A direct quantum mechanical calculation, starting from the correlation function

$$\frac{\langle u(t,\mathbf{r})u(t,0)\rangle}{\langle u(t)\rangle^2} - 1, \tag{6}$$

where $u$ is the energy density of the radiation, yields a result that diverges in the large-$k$ limit, $\mathcal{P}(k) \sim k^4/T^4$, although it is not entirely clear what this means in terms of observable effects. (We shall present this calculation elsewhere.) Secondly, we are now in the situation where for cosmologically interesting scales, the physical length scale before the start of inflation is smaller than the Planck length, and in that case a calculation that ignores quantum gravity is untenable.

In our view, these problems pose a real difficulty for the theory of inflation. Note that even if there is no pre-inflationary thermal phase, inflation itself implies a thermal background, because de Sitter space has a horizon and there is therefore a Gibbons–Hawking temperature. The physical Gibbons-Hawking temperature is $H_\mathrm{infl}/2\pi$, or equivalently in terms of comoving variables $T_\mathrm{GH} = aH_\mathrm{infl}/2\pi$. In other words, at the time of horizon exit we *always* have $k \sim T_\mathrm{GH}$. It is perhaps not obvious whether the estimates of the magnitude of thermal perturbations still apply, but to the extent that they do, it would suggest that even in this case there would be density perturbations of order unity, making predictions of later evolution problematic.

We wish to acknowledge helpful correspondence with Michael Joyce, Joao Magueijo, Ian Moss and David Wands.

---

[1] A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 347 (1981).
[2] A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1220 (1982).

[3] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **108**, 389 (1982).
[4] G. F. Smoot *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **396**, L1 (1992).
[5] C. Bennett *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **148**, 97 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0302208].
[6] D. N. Spergel *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **170**, 377 (2007) [arXiv:astro-ph/0603449].
[7] G. Hinshaw *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **180**, 225 (2009) [arXiv:0803.0732 [astro-ph]].
[8] E. Komatsu *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **192**, 18 (2011) [arXiv:1001.4538 [astro-ph.CO]].
[9] J. A. Frieman and M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **30**, 265 (1984).
[10] J. Magueijo and P. Singh, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 023510 (2007) [arXiv:astro-ph/0703566].
[11] T. Vachaspati and M. Trodden, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 023502 (1999) [arXiv:gr-qc/9811037].
[12] A. Vilenkin, Phys. Lett. B **117**, 25 (1982).
[13] J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 2960 (1983).
[14] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **129**, 177 (1983).
[15] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **175**, 395 (1986).
[16] P. Ferreira and J. Magueijo, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 061301 (2008) [arXiv:0708.0429 [astro-ph]].
[17] J. M. Bardeen, P. J. Steinhardt and M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 679 (1983).